

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re OPTICAL DISK DRIVE ANTITRUST
LITIGATION

Case No. [10-md-02143-RS](#) (JCS)

**AMENDED¹ ORDER DENYING
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL**


Re: Dkt. No. 1948

On September 21, 2016, the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs filed an administrative motion to file certain material under seal. *See* Admin. Mot. (dkt. 1948). The only stated basis for sealing is that the material at issue was designated by Defendants as “Confidential” or “Confidential-Restricted” under the parties’ stipulated protective order. *See id.*

Civil Local Rule 79-5(e) provides that when a party moves to file under seal on the basis that another party has designated material as confidential, “the Designating Party must file a declaration as required by subsection 79-5(d)(1)(A) establishing that all of the designated material is sealable” within four days. Civ. L.R. 79-5(e)(1). That time has expired and Defendants have not filed a responsive declaration. The administrative motion is therefore DENIED, and the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs are ORDERED to file the material at issue in the public record no earlier than October 3, 2016 and no later than October 7, 2016. *See* Civ. L.R. 79-5(e)(2).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 27, 2016


JOSEPH C. SPERO
Chief Magistrate Judge

¹ This Amended Order supersedes the previously filed Order (dkt. 1954) and corrects a clerical error regarding the dates for filing material in the public record. As reflected below, the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs are ordered to file the material at issue in October, not September.